

LORD CRANBORNE

Great-grandparents.

1. James, 2nd Marquess of Salisbury, related on his mother's side to the 1st Duke of Wellington; father of Robert, 3rd Marquess of Salisbury, Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary; grandfather of Arthur, 1st Earl Balfour, Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary and of several other notable members of the Cecil and Balfour families.

2. Frances, daughter of Bamber Gascoigne of a well-known commercial family; her great-grandfather was Lord Mayor of London, her uncle a general.

3. Sir Edward Alderson, Senior Wrangler and subsequently a judge, 1st cousin of Sir James Alderson, President of the College of Physicians, and of Amelia, Mrs. Opie, poet and novelist.

4. Georgina, daughter of Rev. Edward Drewe, related on her mother's side to the later generations of the Darwin and Wedgwood families.

5. Philip Gore, 4th Earl of Anan, uncle of Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, and of Spencer Gore, first lawn tennis champion.

6. Elizabeth, daughter of Gen. Sir William Napier, historian, niece of Gen. Sir Charles and Gen. Sir George Napier and of Henry Napier, historian.

7. Robert, Viscount Jocelyn, uncle of Roden Noel, poet.

8. Frances, daughter of the 5th Earl Cowper, niece of Lord Melbourne, Prime Minister.

The positive eugenic value of the above ascents needs no elaboration.

W. T. J. GUN.

Jews and Nordics

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I write, not as a Jew, but as the descendant of members of the East Anglian peasantry for as far back as I can follow. Most members of my family would be taken for text-book anthropological specimens of the Nordic type. Certainly we are all much more Nordic in appearance than say Herr Hitler, Herr Goebbels and ex-Captain Goering. Therefore I will not be suspected of any subjective bias when I assure Mr. Thompson (January 1936, page 351) that his thinly veiled attempt to stir up anti-Semitism under the pretence of eugenic policy appertains to the dark ages of barbarism and not to objective biological science.

It is certainly true that Professor Ruggles Gates and others have pointed to certain cases where hybridization of widely differing sub-races has been attended with the production of biological disharmony. This is exactly what one would expect on Mendelian principles. Segregation of a great number of differing genetic factors inevitably means that in some cases the inferior ones will gather together. Where both intermingling stocks are on the whole inferior, the incidence of biological

disharmony is greatest. But the converse is also true. The best genetic factors appertaining to each race may segregate out together. The result may be hybrids better than either parent stock. This in fact seems the only explanation of the remarkable fact noted by such competent thinkers as Havelock Ellis and Kretschmer—viz. that the areas of greatest racial admixture, e.g. East Anglia, Swabia and the Netherlands, are also the districts providing the highest proportion of men of eminence or genius.

As to the Jewish race, I am not prejudiced. I do not like Jewish peddlers nor certain types of Jewish physiognomy. But simple justice compels me to declare that no other race under the sun exhibits so glorious a record of religious, philosophical, scientific and artistic genius. Witness the illustrious roll of fame from Maimonides to Einstein, witness the record of Jews in the country which now so foully persecutes them, where they contributed no less than ten times their expected proportion to the roll of Nobel prize-winners. I defy Mr. Thompson to produce one tittle of evidence to show that Nordic-Semitic crosses have produced more inferior than superior types. Admitted that such crossings have been attended with lamentable consequences. But that is the fault of the enemies of humanity and justice who tear the wife from the husband, the children from the parents, and by a calculated and deliberate policy, seek to starve a whole population, of the same race as Jesus and Mary, out of existence. I challenge Mr. Thompson to produce any scientific basis whatsoever for the wild assertions he has made. I warn him that in seeking to controvert my challenge it is no good going to such authorities as the alleged protocols of the Elders of Zion nor to the perverted anthropology which, not much more accurate, rules in Germany to-day. Mr. Thompson is too far from England to realize, what every decent Englishman thinks to-day, that anti-Semitism is an offence against every principle of justice and decency which the true traditions of this country uphold.

The above largely replies to Mr. Goethe (January 1936, page 351). When such contemptible doctrines as these are associated with the word of Nordic, is it any wonder that every fair-minded individual is disposed to throw it out of the window. For myself, if anyone calls me a Jew, I will not trouble to correct the misnomer. But if anyone really wants to insult me, perhaps the best way he can do so is to call me Nordic.

HERBERT BREWER.

Maldon, Essex.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—The letters in the January 1936 number from Mr. Norman A. Thompson and Mr. C. M. Goethe represent not only unscientific biology but worse sociology. The former is worried about the disastrous biological effects of racial crosses between Jews and Germanic stocks. There is no